

MEMOIRS OF LITERATURE.

MONDAY, February 19. 1711.

DEFENSE des Saints Peres accusez de Platonisme. A Paris, chez le Conte & Montalant, Quay des Augustins, près la rue Pavée, à la Ville de Montpellier. 1711.

That is, *A Defense of the Holy Fathers charged with Platonism.* Paris. 1711. in 4to. Pagg. 640.

I Design'd to go on with my Account of the Supplement mentioned in the last Sheet; but I rather chuse to insert here the following Extract of the *Defense of the Holy Fathers charged with Platonism*. That Book is newly come out at Paris: The Subject of it is both Curious and of great Importance; and therefore I thought the Publick would be better pleas'd with it than with any thing else.

This Work is a new Production of Father Balsu, Author of the *Answer to the History of Oracles*. It is divided into Four Books. In the First, the Author shews, that the Fathers were not bred up in Plato's Philosophy. In the Second, he undertakes to prove that they never followed the Platonick Philosophy upon any Doctrine whatsoever. He endeavours to shew, in the Third, that they did not only reject and condemn it in general, but also writ against the Principal Parts of it; that they confuted all its Errors with great Strength, and left nothing unattempted to confound Plato, and render him contemptible to every body. Lastly, he examines, in the Fourth Book, all the Pretences that have occasion'd the Charge of Platonism laid upon the Fathers, and answers the Objections.

I. If the Fathers were bred up in Plato's Philosophy, it must be (says the Author) for one of these Three Reasons: Either because that Philosophy was commonly taught in the Christian Schools, in which they were instructed; or because in their private Studies they applied themselves to that Philosophy preferably to any other; or because it was in vogue in the Heathen Schools, where those Fathers might have learn'd it before their Conversion: Three Suppositions, the Falsity whereof Father Balsu undertakes to demonstrate.

To begin with the First, the Christians, far from teaching Plato's Philosophy in their Schools, were wholly taken up with reading and explaining the Holy Scripture. One may easily be convinc'd of it by what we read in Eusebius concerning the Christian School of Alexandria, the most Ancient and the most Famous of all. Nothing was taught in it (says that Father) but *Holy Writ, the Divine Sciences, the Sacred Dogmes*; which is the Reason why it went by the Name of *School of the Catecheses*. The same ought to be said of the other Christian Schools of that Time, such as those of *Cæsarea, Edessus, Nisibis, &c.* Far from teaching the Heathen Philosophy in those Schools, Care was taken to confute its Errors, and to make the Faithful and the Catechumens abhor it. It was with such a Design that Origen, Pambanus, Dionysius, and others, who taught in the School of Alexandria, applied themselves to the Study of the Pagan Philosophy, which did not a little contribute to the Errors, for which Origen was so severely censured.

True, that besides the School of the Catecheses there were others at Alexandria, in which some Christians taught Philosophy publicly; witness Ammonius Master of Origen, and Anasolius, who became Bishop of Laodicea. But did those Christian Philosophers adopt any particular Sect, especially that of Plato, as 'tis pretended? As for what concerns Anasolius, if he embraced any Sect of Philosophy, it was doubtless that of Aristotle; and as for the famous Ammonius, he was neither a Platonist nor an Aristotelian, but chusing the most reasonable Doctrines of those two Sects, he drew a new Plan of Philosophy, consisting only of certain Truths, such as God's Providence, and the Immortality of the Soul, wherein he shew'd that those Two Philosophers agreed. It was also the Method of Origen his Disciple, who did not allow any body to apply himself to any Sect of Philosophy, nor to yield to the Authority of any Philosopher: And such was the Conduct of Clement Alexandrinus, the Predecessor of Origen in the Chair of the Catecheses, as one may see in his *Stromate*. Lactantius had also the same Notion: He believ'd that it was of great use to the Christian Religion to collect all the Truths scattered in the several Sects of the Philosophers, without professing any. The Aversion of the Ancient Christians for all the Sects of Philosophers, proceeded from this, viz. That those different Sects making part of Paganism, were thereby more contrary to Christianity than the Sects of Luther and Calvin to the Church of Rome: And therefore it would be as great an Absurdity to pretend that the Fathers followed a certain Sect of the Heathen Philosophy, as to pretend that they were fond of a Sect of the Ancient Hereticks.

It were in vain to object that the Learned Christians of those Times might have followed the Heathen Philosophers in such things as agreed with the Doctrines of Christianity, or at least in those wherein Religion was not concern'd, such as are most Questions relating to Natural Philosophy; as in our Days they apply themselves, in such Matters, to the Principles of *Aristotle*, *Plato*, *Democritus*, and *Epicurus*. But it ought to be consider'd, that Christianity cannot be endangered now by such a Method, since Paganism is wholly extinct; whereas it prevailed still in the Time of the Fathers, and the Philosophers were the most zealous Defenders of the Pagan Religion, and the most violent Enemies to Christianity. And therefore the Fathers, far from favouring the Philosophers, even in their best Notions, call them Plagiarists, and shew that they took from the Sacred Writings their most reasonable Doctrines, which they frequently disfigured and corrupted by many Errors. As for the Doctrines relating to Natural Philosophy, not to say that the Fathers look'd upon them to be of little use by Reason of their Uncertainty, and the many Contradictions of the Philosophers; they believed that the Connexion of those Doctrines with some Essential Truths, about which the Heathen Philosophers vented a Thousand Errors, might render those Doctrines dangerous to Christianity. The contempt, which the Ancient Christians express'd for Natural Philosophy, appears here in a full Light, by several Testimonies of *Eusebius*, *Socrates*, *Theodoret*, and *Lactantius*. Nothing can be more agreeable than the ingenious Raillery of *Hermias* upon the various Opinions of the Ancient Philosophers, concerning the Principles of Natural Bodies; a Raillery not unlike those that are to be found in *Lucian* upon the same Subject. "If I follow *Anaxagoras* (*says Hermias*), he will teach me that a Spiritual and Intelligent Being framed the Universe, and disposed the several Parts of it: when he tells me so, I have an Esteem for him; and yield to his Opinion. But here comes *Melissus* and *Parmenides*: The latter teaches me, in his fine Verses, that the World is Eternal, Infinite, Unmoveable, and always like it self; and I can't tell how it comes to pass, that he brings me over to his Opinion. Thus *Parmenides* drives *Anaxagoras* out of my Mind. When I think I am well settled in that Doctrine, *Anaximenes* cries out in my Ears, and tells me, I maintain that the whole Universe is nothing but Air, which growing thick produces Water, being rarified produces Fire, and returning its first State, becomes pure Air, as it was before. I begin to like the Doctrine of *Anaximenes*, and I grow fond of him. Whereupon, *Empedocles* appears to me in a fit of Anger, and cries out from the Furnaces of Mount *Etna*, that Enmity and Amity are the Principles of all Things: the latter, by uniting them; the former, by separating them; and that their mutual Opposition is the Cause of all Effects. I must farther observe, says he, that they are Like and Unlike, Infinite and Finite, Eternal, and yet produced in time. You are an admirable Man, *Empedocles*: I would gladly follow you as far as your Furnaces, were it not for *Protagoras*, who takes me aside, and tells me, That Man is the End and Rule of all Things; that whatever falls under his Senses, is real; and whatever does not fall under them, is nothing. Being wrought upon by this Discourse of *Protagoras*, I am glad the Universe, and most Things contain'd in it, belong to Man. *Thales*, on the other side, beckens to me, that he will teach me the Truth: He says, that Water is the Principle of all Things; that every Thing is formed by Moisture, and resolved into it. Why should I not believe *Thales*? Is he not the most Ancient Philosopher of the *Ionick* Sect? Nevertheless *Anaximander*, his Countryman, informs me, that Motion is the first Principle of all Things; since it is the Cause of the Production of some, and of the Corruption of others. I must needs say that *Anaximander* is a very credible Man. But *Archelaus*, who lays down Heat and Cold for his Principles, is also very credible. And yet *Plato*, that fine Speaker, is not of his Opinion, since he admits God, Matter, and Idea, for his Principles. Now I must yield; for can I forbear submitting to that Philosopher, who made so magnificent a Chariot for *Jupiter*? But I hear behind me *Aristotle*, his Disciple, who being Jealous of his Master's Glory, suggests other Principles to me, viz. the Act and the

Subject: He says the former is incapable of receiving any Quality; whereas the latter receives Four, viz. Driness, Moisture, Heat and Cold; and that all Things are produced and destroyed by the Change of those Four Qualities, which succeed one another. I am weary of so many Opinions, whereby I have been so long hurried up and down: I will therefore keep to *Aristotle*. But what shall I do? Some other Philosophers, more ancient than he, make me uneasy, *Pherecydes*, *Leucippus*, *Democritus*, &c.

What remains is to enquire, Whether Platonism was the prevailing Philosophy in the Pagan Schools; and whether the Ancient Fathers took it from those Schools. But, says the Author, there is no manner of Probability in that Supposition. For not only all the other Sects taken together exceeded that of *Plato* in Number; but besides 'tis certain, that the Platonists in the Three first Centuries of Christianity, were less numerous, if compared with every other particular Sect. *Father Balsus* gives us a compendious History of the Sect of *Plato* or the *Academicks*, whereby it appears that this Philosophy fell into decay soon after the death of *Plato*, the Disciples of that Philosopher having forsaken or corrupted the greatest part of his Doctrines; viz. *Arcefilaus*, who profess'd to doubt of every thing; *Carneades* and *Clitomachus* Authors of a third Academy; *Philo* and *Antiochus* Authors of a Fourth and Fifth; insomuch that the Platonick Philosophy was wholly destroyed, when Christianity appear'd in the World. The Platonists are no more talk'd of till the Reign of the *Antonini*. *Plotinus* undertook to revive Platonism, under the Empire of *Galienus*; but if we believe *Eusebius*, notwithstanding all his Endeavours that Sect had but few Followers. On the contrary, the other Sects flourish'd in the first Ages of the Christian Church; especially those of the Peripateticks, and Stoicks, and even of the *Epicureans*. But, says the Author, it was in the Schools of Rhetorick that most of the ancient Learned Christians were taught, and few came from those of Philosophy, which were look'd upon as the Centre of Idolatry and Impiety, especially those of the Platonists.

II. The Author having proved, that the Fathers were not bred up in the Platonick Philosophy, proceeds to shew that they did not follow it: He does not except those Fathers, who frequented the Platonick Schools before their Conversion. They rejected the Heathen Philosophy in general, and that of *Plato* in particular; the more, because they look'd upon it as a Part of Heathenism. In effect, of the Three Sorts of Pagan Theology mention'd by *Varro*, and several Authors after him, the Philosophical Theology was the most considerable, and lay the greatest Claim to the Name and Authority of *Plato*. The Fathers could not therefore express too great an Aversion for the Opinions of that Philosopher: all of them did it, as *Father Balsus* shews, beginning with *Justin Martyr*; who being the only Father of the first Ages of the Christian Church bred up in Platonism, might be suspected of having introduced it into Christianity. But the Readers will see the contrary, by reading the Passages collected by the Author. It will appear from those Passages, that *Justin Martyr* equally rejected *Plato's* Philosophy and that of *Aristotle*, even in those Things that seem to be most indifferent; and that he acknowledged no other Masters in Philosophy but the Prophets and Apostles. *Tertullian* inveighs much more against the Platonists than against all the other Philosophers. *Theophilus Anti-ocheus* is not more favourable to them. *Lactantius* confutes the Pagan Philosophy, in all its Parts, with the same Vigor, and particularly applies himself to lay open the Errors of *Plato*. *St. Cyprian* is much of the same Opinion with *Lactantius*. All these Things are fully proved, by a Multitude of Passages quoted at large, and in the very Words of the Originals.

To all those Authorities, *Father Balsus* adds the Testimonies of *St. Augustin* and *Eusebius*; which are the more authentick, because those Fathers writ large Volumes to confute the whole Pagan Theology, especially *Plato's* Philosophy, which was the most dangerous and the most seducing Kind of it. It was the Design of *St. Augustin*, in his Books de *Civitate Dei*, wherein he confutes the Errors of the Platonists. 'Tis true, he prefers them to the other Sects; but if they appear to him better, 'tis only by comparing them with worse Philosophers; a Preference

rence that is not much for their Honour. He compares the *Platonists* with *Frogs*, that are silent when it thunders; he says their Opinions are very foolish things, advanced by some great Men: Nay, he condemns in his *Retractions* some indifferent Praises he had bestowed upon them; being above all things as unwilling as the other Fathers, to adopt their Expressions. As for *Eusebius*, his Testimony is the less to be suspected, because being an *Adrian*, he should have been fond of *Plato*. Nevertheless, in his *Books de Preparatione Evangelica*, he strongly confutes the *Platonick* Philosophy, and goes chiefly upon these Two Reasons. 1. That all the Good Things contain'd in that Philosophy, either in Morals, or in Logick or Natural Philosophy, is originally derived from the Doctrine of the *Hebrews*; and that therefore one must leave the Stream, and go to the Fountain-Head. 2. That the *Platonick* Philosophy is full of monstrous Errors, and needless Questions; to which he opposes the Antiquity, Certainty, and Purity of the Philosophy of the *Hebrews*. This Opinion of *Eusebius* may be seen at large in the VIIIth, IXth, and Xth Chapters of this IIId. Book.

Father *Baltus*, not contented with all these Arguments, brings in many others. The first is taken from the Commentaries of those Fathers upon the Creation in Six Days; in which, had they follow'd *Plato's* Philosophy, they would have explain'd the first Chapters of *Genesis* agreeably to the System of that Philosophy; as most of our Modern Interpreters have done, who endeavour to adapt those Chapters to their Philosophical Hypotheses. The Fathers took a quite different Method, out of Contempt for all manner of Heathen Philosophy. Far from admitting the *Platonick* Opinions in their Commentaries upon the *Hexameron*, the first thing they do is to reject them; witness *St. Basil*, *St. Ambrose*, and others who are more ancient. Nay, they will not admit them upon some Matters, wherein they might agree with the Scripture; as concerning the Waters above the Firmament, the Figure of the World, &c. Tho' the Fathers carried their Abhorrence for the whole Heathen Philosophy too far, upon several Occasions; that very thing plainly shews they were not *Platonists*. Which may be wonderfully confirm'd by this Circumstance; viz. That the Heathens objected against the Christians, that they had laid aside all manner of Philosophy; as one may see in *Tatian*, in *Origen* against *Celsus*, in *Eusebius*, and *St. Cyril* against *Julian* the Apostate. 'Tis an easy thing to perceive by those Objections, and the Answers the Christians made to them, that if they condemned in general all the Sects of Philosophy, they hated above all that of the *Platonists*, which they cried down, and the Absurdities whereof they discover'd upon all Occasions. But (said *Julian* to them) why then do you study the Sciences of the Greeks, since you say that your Scripture is sufficient to teach you every thing? It appears from *St. Cyril's* Answer to this Objection, that the Christians valued nothing but the Language in the Books of the Heathens, and despised every thing else.

The Author alledges another Argument, to shew that the Ancient Fathers opposed the *Pagan* Philosophy; viz. That those who went about to justify the Use of *Aristotle's* Philosophy in these latter Times, found nothing in the Fathers of the Church, whereby such a Practice might be authorized. Father *Baltus* proves it by the Example of *Melchior Canus* and *Petavius*. His last Proof is grounded upon this; viz. That the Fathers objected against the Hereticks, that they followed the *Platonick* Philosophy, and took their Errors from it; which he proves at large, and with great Clearness.

III. The Author having shown that the Fathers did not follow the *Platonick* Philosophy; undertakes to prove that they opposed it with great Force. The first Error of *Plato*, which the Fathers attack'd, was Polytheism and Idolatry; for tho' he had some Knowledge of the True God, he admitted many other Gods unknown to the most Superstitious Heathens; and those Deities make part of his Philosophical System. Father *Baltus* gives a very particular Account of that Polytheism; and shews how *Justin Martyr*, *Origen*, *Eusebius*, *Theodoret*, and the other Fathers confuted it. He pretends, that *Plato* cannot be excus'd upon this Head, without belying all Sacred and Prophane Antiquity. In the next place, he shews that the Fondness of that Philosopher for Divination, and his be-

lieving that the Practice of the Theurgy, or the Worship of Interior Gods, was one of the most effectual Means of purifying the Soul from its Pollutions, did not a little contribute to the Magical Superstitions of his Followers. To these Motives he adds their Jealousy of Christianity, and the Desire of working Miracles in Opposition to it. The Readers will find here a curious and diverting Enumeration of those pretended Miracles, wrought by the *Platonists*, who lived after the Beginning of Christianity, and seriously mention'd by them.

The Author proceeds to the Doctrine of *Plato* concerning the Nature of the Soul, compos'd (according to that Philosopher) of Two Parts, the one Spiritual, and the other Corporeal, and subject to a Revolution call'd *Metempsychosis*. He alledges some Passages of the Fathers, among others, of *Theodoret*, *St. Irenaeus* and *St. Chrysostom*, wherein that Error, and all the favourable Constructions put upon it by some new *Platonists*, are strongly confuted. Besides, he rejects the Explication of that *Metempsychosis*, advanc'd by a Modern Interpreter; and endeavours to prove, that it is contrary to the Opinion of all the Heathens in general, and of the *Platonists* in particular, but especially to that of the Fathers. Those Fathers (says the Author) have not been more favourable to the Doctrine of *Plato* concerning the Return of the Souls from Heaven upon Earth, nor to their pretended Reminiscence.

The Author discourses, in the next place, of the Errors of that Philosopher relating to Natural Philosophy. He charges him, after the Fathers, with making Matter Eternal, and looking upon it as the Cause of Evil; and answers what has been alledg'd by the Interpreter above-mention'd in *Plato's* Vindication upon that Head. Afterwards he examines the Opinion of that Philosopher concerning the Nature of Ideas; an Opinion not wholly rejected by *Eusebius* and *St. Augustin*, but disapproved by the greatest part of the other Fathers, who put upon it the Sense of *Aristotle*. As for the Eternity of the World, tho' it be a doubtful thing whether *Plato* taught such a Doctrine, 'tis but too true (says the Author) that the *Platonists* maintain'd it. The Fathers confuted this Opinion, and the Ridiculous Fables they gave out concerning the different Bodies which the Soul assumed, according to the different Elements it happen'd to be in, and concerning the perpetual Return of the same Persons and of the same Events.

Father *Baltus* does not entertain a more favourable Opinion of *Plato's* Morality, than of his Natural Philosophy, and Theology: He examines the several Errors contain'd in it, which were confuted by the Fathers, and particularly by *Theodoret*. He therefore wonders that the Learned Translator, frequently quoted by him, should so highly commend that Morality, and alledge some Reasons for his Amazement. He cannot apprehend upon what Grounds that Interpreter undertook to justify the Banquet of *Plato*, contrary to the Judgment of *St. Cyril* and *Theodoret*. He denies that *Plato* knew the Virtue call'd Humility: on the contrary, he shews that the Books of that Philosopher are full of Pride and Vanity; that the Irony of *Socrates* was only a disguised Pride; that the humble Man of *Plato*, call'd *Timaeus*, had at most (according to *Origen*) an outside of Humility; in a Word, that *Plato* had not the first Notions of that Virtue, which was only taught by Christ.

As for the most reasonable Doctrines of that Philosopher, the Fathers were persuaded, says the Author, that he took them from the Sacred Writings. But they affirm at the same time, that he corrupted those Doctrines by his Errors, partly not to seem to depart too much from the Opinions commonly received; partly out of Ignorance, putting a wrong Sense upon what he read or heard; and partly out of Vanity, to disguise his Pillferings. This is grounded upon the Testimony of *Clement Alexandrinus*, *Origen*, *Justin Martyr*, *Tertullian*, *Tatian*, *Minutius Felix*, *Theodoret*, and *St. Cyril*.

In the next place, the Author shews what the Fathers thought of *Plato* and his Philosophy, with Respect to the Effects it produced. Those Fathers maintain, that *Plato* does not deserve to be compared with the meanest Christian; that his Philosophy is altogether useless, since it could persuade no body, whereas the Cross of Jesus Christ has persuaded the whole World of the most Important Truths;

Truths; that no City was ever governed according to the Laws of *Plato*, whereas the Apostles caused the Laws of Christ to be observed all over the Earth; that *Plato* could not persuade his Disciple *Aristotle* of his Doctrine, concerning the Immortality of the Soul, while the Apostles convinced all Nations of that Truth. The Reasons alledged by the Fathers to shew why that Philosophy did little good to the World, are not for the Honour of *Plato*. "He was a Man (say they) full of Vanity, who did not care to teach useful Things, but only to make a shew of his Eloquence. Which is the Reason of that Verbosity, tedious Prolixity, and Obscurity that appear in his Works, whereby they would be of no use, though they should contain some good Things". As for what concerns the Eloquence of *Plato*, the Fathers of the Church (says the Author) commend him for it. "Nay it may be said, that they omitted nothing to persuade every body of it; but it was in order to set off the Victory which the Christian Religion obtain'd over that Philosopher, by shewing, that notwithstanding all his Eloquence, and the great Reputation he acquired among the Heathens, he had been overcome and exterminated, with the whole Pagan Philosophy, by some poor Fishermen, who had neither Learning nor Eloquence, and were as contemptible, in the Eyes of the World, as *Plato* and his Followers were Illustrious, Powerful and Considerable.

IV. Father *Baltus* examines in the IVth Book several Reasons alledged to prove the *Platonism* of the Fathers, and undertakes to shew the Weakness of those Arguments. He brings under Four Principal Heads what concerns the Origin and Progress of that Opinion.

The first is the prepossession of most Learned Men, who believe it was with *Plato's* Philosophy in the first Ages of the Christian Church, as with that of *Aristotle* in these latter Ages. The Author refers the Reader to the preceding Books, where he has confuted that Opinion, and proceeds to the Second Reason, grounded upon the Encomiums bestowed upon *Plato* and his Philosophy by the Fathers. *Clement Alexandrinus*, *Iustin Martyr*, and *St. Augustin* are particularly quoted upon that Account. To begin with *Clement Alexandrinus*, who (according to *M. le Clerc*) commends *Plato* so far as to ascribe to him something prophetic, Father *Baltus* says that Supposition is

LEIPSICK.

THE following Book has been lately printed at *Rudolstadt*.

Selecta Poetica, quibus continentur Ge. Sabinus Præcepta, Ulrici ab Hutten Ars Versificatoria, Cl. Espenæi Elegia selectiores, & Samuelis Rachelii Classis Imperatorum metricæ: Collegit Joaque adjectis Carminibus Joannes Henricus Acker. Rudolstadt, 1711. in 8vo.

The Pieces contain'd in this Collection, deserved to be reprinted. The Rules of *George Sabinus* for the making of Verses, are very much esteemed, by reason of their Brevity and Clearness. He treats of the Choice and Disposition of Words, of Epithets, Figures, and Harmony, and of the Faults and Beauties of Verses. That Author was so affected with Poetry, that he could not forbear weeping, when he read an excellent Poem, as *Camerarius* observes in the Life of *Melancthon*. *Sabinus* says nothing of Invention; and therefore *M. Acker* has added some Observations of his own relating to that Subject.

only built upon a Passage of that Writer, wherein we read prophetically instead of poetically, which is the true Reading, as it appears from *Eusebius*; and that *Clement*, far from taking *Plato* for a kind of Prophet, did always look upon him as a Plagiarist, and a Corrupter of the Prophets. The Author denies what *M. le Clerc* says, that this Father profess'd three different Sets of the Pagan Philosophy, and adopted several of their Errors, among others, the Eternity of Matter. The Praises bestowed upon *Plato* by *Iustin Martyr*, are not a better Proof of the *Platonism* of that Father; and it does not appear from the Passages quoted by *M. le Clerc*, (says the Author,) that *Iustin* had a greater Notion of *Plato* than of other Philosophers, and of the Poets themselves. As for *St. Augustin*, if he seems, in some places, to be more favourable to *Plato* than the more Ancient Fathers, 'tis because *Platonism* being almost destroyed in his time, those Praises were not of so dangerous a Consequence with Respect to Christianity: Though, to speak the Truth, the Encomiums which *St. Augustin* bestows upon *Plato*, are only design'd to shew that this Father was in the right to pitch upon the *Platonism* among all other Philosophers, to confute their Errors. If *St. Augustin* found in the Books of the New *Platonists* the beginning of *St. John's Gospel*, 'tis because those Philosophers made it their own, as well as several other Doctrines which they borrowed from Christianity.

The Third Reason, why the Fathers have been charged with *Platonism*, proceeds from the Method of some Famous Authors, who being puzzled with some Expressions of the Fathers, concerning the Mystery of the Trinity, laid the Fault upon *Plato's* Philosophy, by supposing, that it had been cultivated by the Ancient Christians. The Author of the *Origeniana*, and the Learned *Petavius* are two of those Writers, who entertain such an Opinion: Father *Baltus* answers them in the IXth and Xth Chapters. He denies that there are some *Platonick* Expressions in the Passages of the Fathers quoted by *Petavius*.

Lastly, he confutes the *Socinians*, who say that the Fathers took their Doctrine, concerning the Trinity, from the *Platonick* Philosophy. In the remaining Part of this Book, the Author makes several Reflexions upon some Passages of *M. le Clerc*, relating to the *Platonism* of the Fathers; and undertakes to prove against him, that *Plato* took several things from the Sacred Writers.

The *Ars Versificatoria* written by *Hulric ab Hutten*, contains several Things, that may be of some Use to young People. His Satyr, entitled *Nemo*, has been added to it. The Elegies of *Claudius Espenæus* are elegant, and worth reading. *M. Acker* has added to those Pieces the *Classis Imperatorum metricæ* of *Samuel Rachelii*, because they are of great Use to form a clear Notion of the Series of all the Emperors, and to fix it in one's Mind.

PARIS.

TWO Satyrs of *M. Despreaux*, translated into Latin, are newly come out. The Translator has been very happy in preserving the Beauties of his Original: His Expressions are just and elegant. This sort of Pieces require a great deal of Labour, when a Man confines himself to translate every Verse into a Latin one, as *M. Hennegrave* has done.

M. Guerin has publish'd an Ode upon History, occasion'd by an Oration of *M. Coffin* concerning the Usefulness of Profane History.

LONDON: Printed by J. Roberts: And Sold by A. Baldwin, near the Oxford Arms in Warwick-Lane. (Price 2 s.)